

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARYLAND CASUALTY COMPANY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

AVALON MANAGEMENT, LLC, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No.: 11-CV-5640 YGR

**ORDER DIRECTING LEAD TRIAL COUNSEL TO
APPEAR IN PERSON TO MEET AND CONFER
REGARDING DISCOVERY DISPUTES**

Counsel submitted a joint letter brief regarding a discovery dispute concerning production of a certified copy of the policy or policies issued by Maryland Casualty Company to Avalon Management, LLC and a copy of the underwriting file for those policies. (Dkt No. 66.)


Lead *trial* counsel with the full authority to resolve all discovery disputes for each party are hereby **ORDERED** to appear personally at the Federal Courthouse, 1301 Clay Street, Oakland, California, on **Friday, December 7, 2012, at 9:30 a.m.** The parties shall proceed to the Clerk's Office and inform Courtroom Deputy Frances Stone that they have arrived, and shall thereafter proceed to meet and confer in person to resolve the outstanding discovery issues. Specifically, counsel shall further meet and confer regarding the form of a protective order to be entered prior to production of the underwriting documents and production of an authenticated copy of the policy at issue. Conference rooms in the Attorney Lounge are available on a first-come, first-serve basis.

Once complete, the parties shall advise Ms. Stone that they have concluded their in-person meeting before requesting the Court's personal attention. The parties shall bring with them copies

1 of relevant correspondence including a copy of Tiburon's Request for Production, Set One.¹ In
2 addition, the parties should bring with them any and all materials which may bear on resolution of
3 the issues, including the imposition of sanctions.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 **Date: November 30, 2012**

6 
7 **YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS**
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE**

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
United States District Court
Northern District of California

¹ The Court notes that no copy of such exhibit was appended to the joint letter as represented therein.